

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 27, 2007. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16-21 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 16-20 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16-21 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. The recitations of Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14 and 15 have been incorporated into their respective base claims (and in fact into all the independent claims), and these dependent claims have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. The specification (including abstract) has been replaced with the substitute specification that is submitted herewith in both a marked and a clean version; no new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The substitute specification addresses the informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicant has tried to identify and correct all other informalities that may be present, but if any additional ones are noted in future, they also will gladly be corrected.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended this claim taking careful account of the points raised in paragraphs 13-15 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9, 17, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,915,119 (Cone) in view of U.S. Patent 6,459,496 (Okazawa). In addition, Claims 5, 13, 18 and 20 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being obvious from those two patents in view of U.S. Patent 6,020,973 (Levine), Claim 4, as being obvious from *Cone* and *Okazawa* in view of U.S. Patent 5,282,270 (Oppenheimer et al.),

and Claims 8, 12 and 16, as being obvious from *Cone* and *Okazawa* in view of *Levine* and *Oppenheimer*.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a peripheral device which can communicate with a plurality of client devices connected to a network, and which comprises notification means, for notifying a proxy response server connectable to the network of a sleep mode transition request when the peripheral device changes from a normal data processing wait status to a sleep mode. Reception means receive a sleep release request from the proxy response server based on a network packet indicating a peripheral device discovery request for a peripheral device which is changing to a predetermined sleep mode issued by any client device connected to the network after the proxy response server receives the sleep mode transition request from the peripheral device. Claim 1 recites, specifically that the network packet which is the peripheral device discovery request is a search request packet for predetermined multicast address set as a predetermined network address for a plurality of peripheral devices. also provided in the apparatus of Claim 1 are control means, for releasing the sleep mode and returning to a data processing wait status when the reception means receive the sleep release request. According to Claim 1, the multicast address for a peripheral device discovery request in a sleep status can be different from a multicast address of a peripheral device discovery request in a normal status.

It is very important in the aspects of the present invention to which Claim 1 and the other independent claims are respectively directed, that the network packet which is the peripheral device discovery request is a search request packet for a predetermined multicast address set as a predetermined network address for a plurality of peripheral

devices, and that the multicast address for a peripheral device discovery request in a sleep status can be different from a multicast address of a peripheral device discovery request in a normal status. By virtue of this structure, it is possible to release the sleep status only for a peripheral device having a predetermined multicast address.

Cone relates to a proxy terminal in which a number of user terminals that can be set in a suspend mode are connected to each of several segments making up a network system. When a give peripheral is in its suspend mode, its inactivity may lead to its address being deleted from a router as a result of a conventional data-aging process. If this occurs, the peripheral is not accessible via that router. Moreover, the terminal that is in suspend mode will not respond to a conventional magic packet if one is issued. To solve this problem, *Cone* provides a proxy terminal to a given network segment to receive requests from the router to a particular user terminal in that segment. In response to receipt of such a request (such as a magic packet), the proxy terminal wakes up the user terminal in question, thus restoring access to that terminal. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that *Cone* does not suggest means for providing a notification when a peripheral enters the suspend mode.

Okazawa relates to a system in which a status signal can be provided by an informing means 111 (see Fig. 1) in an interface section 150 to a host unit, by means of which the host unit knows the current status of the printer 100 to which the interface unit 150 belongs (col. 5, lines 16-23). As is noted in the Office Action, neither *Cone* nor *Okazawa*, nor the proposed combination of them, teaches or suggests that the network packet that is the peripheral device discovery request is a search request packet for a multicast address set as a predetermined network address for a plurality of peripherals.

Oppenheimer, which was applied in combination with *Cone* and *Okazawa* against Claims 2 and 3, relates to a method and apparatus for determining the location of an entity an alias (or entity name) in a communication system. *Oppenheimer* uses multicast to form the alias. Nonetheless, even if the proposed combination of *Oppenheimer* with *Cone* and *Okazawa* is deemed to be a proper one, Applicant submits that the result of that combination would still accommodate the multicast address for a peripheral device discovery request in a sleep status being different from a multicast address of a peripheral device discovery request in a normal status, as is recited in Claim 1, nor would that combination in any way suggest any arrangement in which the multicast address could be, or should be able to be, different from the multicast address of the peripheral device discovery request in a normal status.

For at least that reason, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over those three patents, taken separately or in any possible combination.

Each of the other independent claims is believed to be allowable over those three patents for at least the reason discussed above with regard to Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of

the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200